

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
. 09/915,412	07/25/2001	Jacob Bar-Tana	23117-0002 DIV 1	8876	
7	7590 . 06/13/2003		·	•	
William Schmonsees Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe 275 Middlefield Road Menlo Park, CA 94025-3506			EXAMINER		
			WHITE, EVERETT NWN		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	1623		
			DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003	1 /	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

L.

•		Application No.		Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary  The MAILING DATE of this communication app								
		09/915,412 Examiner		BAR-TANA, JACOE				
		EVERETT WHI	re	1623				
					ress			
P riod for Reply				•				
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the ma  If the period for reply specified above  If NO period for reply is specified ab	HIS COMMUNICATION.  e under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 iling date of this communication.  re is less than thirty (30) days, a reply bove, the maximum statutory period we pended period for reply will, by statute, er than three months after the mailing	6(a). In no event, how within the statutory min ill apply and will expire cause the application to	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from ( to become ABANDONED	ely filed  will be considered timely, the mailing date of this con (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.			
1)⊠ Responsive to comr	munication(s) filed on 24 M	<u>1arch 2003</u> .		•				
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b>	2b)∐ Thi	s action is non-f	nal.		,			
	n is in condition for allowa				merits is			
Disposition of Claims	e with the practice under E	ex parte Quayle,	1933 C.D. 11, 4	33 O.G. 213.	•			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-9 and</u>	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-9 and 21-31</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above clair	m(s) <u>21-31</u> is/are withdraw	n from consider	ation.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2 and 5-9</u>	is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are s	ubject to restriction and/or	election require	ment.		•			
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed o								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
				ved by the Examiner				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 11	•							
13) ☐ Acknowledgment is n		priority under 35	5 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).								
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachment(s)		-						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTC 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent 3) Information Disclosure Statemer	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s atent Application (PTO				

Art Unit: 1623

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

- The amendment filed March 24, 2003 has been received, entered and carefully 1. considered. The amendment affects the instant application accordingly:
- Claims 3, 4 and 10-20 have been canceled. (A)
- Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. (B)
- Comments regarding the Office Action have been provided drawn to: (C)
  - (a)
  - 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection, which has been withdrawn; 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection, which has been withdrawn; (b)
  - 103(a) rejection, which has been maintained for the reasons of record. (c)
- Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 21-31 are pending in the case; Claims 21-31 have been 2. withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.
- The text of those sections of title 35, U. S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Claims 1-9, in Paper No. 12 is 4. acknowledged.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing 5. to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants amended Claim 1 to indicate that the "heteroatoms are selected from the group consisting of nitrogen, oxygen and sulfur". However, the instant specification does not support this passage since there is no indication in the instant specification that the heteroatoms thereof are selected from nitrogen, oxygen and sulfur atoms. Hence, the instant specification does fulfill the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, which requires that the specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable

Art Unit: 1623

any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same. The insertion into Claim 1 the passage "selected from the group consisting of nitrogen, oxygen and sulfur," raises the issue of new matter, which is improper under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 and renders Claims 1 and dependent Claims 2 and 5-9 improper.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 5-9 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hertz et al ("Mode of Action of Peroxisome Proliferators as Hypolipidemic Drugs Suppression of Apoliprotein C-III", The Journal of Biological Chemistry, Vol. 270, No. 22, Issued June 2, pp. 13470-13475, 1995) for the reasons disclosed on page 5 of the Office Action mailed September 16, 2002.
- 8. Claims 1, 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bar-Tana (US Patent No. 4,689,344) for the reasons disclosed on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action mailed September 16, 2002.
- 9. Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copper et al. (US Patent No. 4,954,487) for the reasons disclosed on pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action mailed September 16, 2002.
- 10. Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al. (US Patent No. 5,502,226) for the reasons disclosed on pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action mailed September 16, 2002.

#### Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed March 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. On page 6 of Applicants response, Applicants argue against the rejection of the claims on the grounds that the cited art does not teach or suggest activity under conditions where the liver is non-responsive to PPAR. Applicants argue that the requirement for CoA-thioesterification leading to suppression of HNF4 activity is neither a process limitation not an indication of use, but a mandatory characteristic for

Art Unit: 1623

activity in PPAR non-responsive species, namely humans. This argument is not persuasive because the arguments presented by Applicants are directed to intended use of the claimed pharmaceutical compositions. The claims are not directed to activity in humans.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., activity in PPAR non-responsive species) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicants have not distinguished the instantly claimed pharmaceutical composition from the compositions of the prior art. Applicants are reminded that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada* 15 USPQ 2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See MPEP 2112.01

### Summary

12. Claims 1, 2 and 5-9 are rejected; Claims 21-31 are withdrawn from consideration.

### Reply to Final Must Include Cancellation

13. This application contains claims 21-31 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in Paper No. 12. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

#### Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1623

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

## Examiner's Telephone Number, Fax Number, and Other Information

15. For 24 hour access to patent application information 7 days per week, or for filing applications, please visit out website at <a href="https://www.uspto.gov">www.uspto.gov</a> and click on the button "Patent Electronic Business Center" for more information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Everett White whose telephone number is (703) 308-4621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reach on (703) 308-4624. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

*V. VV*MUL E Mhita

JAMES O. WILSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Technology Center 1600